UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

JOEY KADMIRI,	Case No.: 2:11-cv-00857-RLH-PAL
Plaintiff,	ORDER
vs.	(Motion to Dismiss–#18)
JASON RICH, and JOHN HOFFMAN, Defendants.	

Before the Court is Defendants Jason Rich and John Hoffman's **Motion to Dismiss** (#18, filed Feb. 23, 2012) based on a failure to state a claim. Plaintiff did not file a Response to the motion.

If one party files a motion to dismiss pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), the party against whom that motion is filed must file points and authorities in opposition to that motion within fourteen (14) days after the service of the motion. Local Rule 7-2(b). The failure of a party to file points and authorities in opposition to any motion constitutes a consent to the Court's grant of the motion. Local Rule 7-2(d).

Rule 7-2(d) of the Local Rules of Practice provides that failure to file points and authorities in opposition to a motion constitutes a consent that the motion be granted. *Abbott v. United Venture Capital, Inc.*, 718 F. Supp. 828, 831 (D. Nev. 1989). It has been said these local

Case 2:11-cv-00857-RLH -PAL Document 26 Filed 04/25/12 Page 2 of 2

	.1
1	rules have the force of law no less than the federal rules or acts of Congress. <i>United States v.</i>
2	Hvass, 355 U.S. 570, 574–75 (1958); see also Weil v. Neary, 278 U.S. 160, 169 (1929); Marshall
3	v. Gates, 44 F.3d 722, 723 (9th Cir. 1995). The United States Supreme Court itself has upheld the
4	dismissal of a matter for failure to respond under the local court rules. Black Unity League of Ky.
5	v. Miller, 394 U.S. 100 (1969).
6	Further, after consideration of the motion, the Court finds that it has merit.
7	Therefore, the Court would grant the motion regardless of Plaintiff's failure to oppose. Thus, the
8	Court dismisses the claims against Defendants in their official capacities, as these are merely
9	insufficient claims against the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. The claims against
10	Defendants in their individual capacities remain.
11	CONCLUSION
12	Accordingly, and for good cause appearing,
13	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (#18) is
14	GRANTED.
15	Dated: April 25, 2012.
16	1 About
17	ROGER L. HUNT
18	United States District Judge
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

AO 72 (Rev. 8/82)